



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,412	08/21/2003	David N.S Hon	29290.01	7755

34263 7590 02/09/2006
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
17TH FLOOR
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER

LEITH, PATRICIA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1655

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 22-24 and 26-42 are pending in the application.

Newly submitted claims 24 and 27-34 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

The Inventions of claims 24 and 27-34 and claims 22-23 and 35-42 respectively are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions Therefore, the methods of Groups I and II are independent since they are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different modes of operation, they have different functions, and/or they have different effects. One would not have to practice the various methods at the same time to practice just one method alone. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. Further, a reference which would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another group.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for each Group is not required for the others, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 24 and 27-34 are hereby withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claims 22-23 and 35-42 were examined on their merits.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a previous Office Action.

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 12/08/05 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of copending Application number 09/716,890 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22-24 remain rejected and 35-42 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicant has amended claims 22 and 35 to specifically recite 'melanoma' and has amended claim 24 to specifically recite 'Kaposi's sarcoma'. The Examiner originally indicated that these embodiments were not enabled. Because Applicant has now amended these claims to include only the non-enabled embodiments, the claims are deemed non-enabled.

Applicant's arguments with regard to this rejection were fully considered, but not found persuasive.

Applicant's principal argument resides in the contention that the Instant specification provides examples where melanoma and Kaposi's sarcoma were treated. However, this argument is not convincing for the following reasons:

First, the examples in the specification relating to melanoma and Kaposi's sarcoma are not directed toward the synthetic mixture of elements as Instantly claimed; on the contrary, they are directed toward an extract of Oak bark. Thus, the examples in the Specification are not commensurate in scope with the *claimed invention*.

Secondly, it is noted that the examples presented in the specification are not accompanied by sound, scientific data including a control subject in order to verify the effectiveness of even the Oak bark extract which was actually shown in the Instant Specification. The examples do not appear to take place in a controlled setting; e.g., were the patients on chemotherapy drugs at the time the oak bark extract was administered? Due to the vast unpredictable nature concerning the cancerous conditions of melanoma and Kaposi's sarcoma, which are known to only be treated via chemotherapy, the skilled artisan could not practice the Invention with any reasonable certainty. Nevertheless, again, the Specification provides no working examples for the synthetic mixture of minerals which is what is actually claimed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

No Claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia Leith whose telephone number is (571) 272-0968. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patricia Leith
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1655

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Patricia Leith', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

02/02/06